



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,323	05/25/2001	Uwe Vogt	MO-6303/LEA 34,646	2946
34947	7590	01/10/2005	EXAMINER	
LANXESS CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT/ BLDG 14 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205-9741			EINSMANN, MARGARET V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/865,323	VOGT, UWE
	Examiner Margaret Einsmann	Art Unit 1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3, 10 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 2, 3 and 11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant is advised that the Notice of Allowance mailed 5/20/2004 is vacated.

If the issue fee has already been paid, applicant may request a refund or request that the fee be credited to a deposit account. However, applicant may wait until the application is either found allowable or held abandoned. If allowed, upon receipt of a new Notice of Allowance, applicant may request that the previously submitted issue fee be applied. If abandoned, applicant may request refund or credit to a specified Deposit Account.

The indicated allowability of claims 1 and 10 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Goldsby. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claims 1-3, 10 and 11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1751

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Goldsby, US 3,742,081.

Applicants claim a mixture of sulfuric acid esters in a process by product format, "obtained by reacting sulfonyl chloride with a mixture of the alcohols R^1OH , R^2OH and R^3OH , wherein R^1 , R^2 and R^3 have the same meanings as for formula (1)". According to claim 1, a,b and c in the formula may be 0,1 or 2 and $a+b+c=2$.

In col 2 lines 47-49 et seq of **US 3,742,081 (Goldsby)**, appears the statement, "The it has been the common practice to recover a mixture of alkyl sulfates such as diisopropyl sulfate and dibutyl sulfate in the extract phase from the extraction step." That disclosed mixture anticipates the claim when $a=2$ and b and $c=0$. Applicant claims that the mixture is made by reacting a mixture of alcohols R^1OH , R^2OH and R^3OH with sulfonyl chloride. In the case above wherein b and c =zero, the mixture includes only two R_1 components. Goldsby differs from the claimed subject matter because he does not disclose forming the mixture by mixing butyl alcohol and isopropyl alcohol with sulfonyl chloride.

The subject matter would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the patentability of a product by process claim does not depend on its method of production and where the examiner has found a similar product, the burden rests with the applicant

to prove that that product is patentably distinct. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985); *In re Marosi et al*, 218 USPQ 289; *In re Pilkington*, 162 USPQ 145.

"The lack of physical description in a product-by-process claim makes the determination of the patentability of the claim more difficult, since in spite of the fact that the claim may recite only process limitations, it is the patentability of the product claimed and not the process that must be established. We are therefore of the opinion that when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be identical with or only slightly different than a product claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or 103 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable. As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685,688 (CCPA 1972).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Goldsby, US 3,742,081.

Goldsby,3,742,081 states at col 1 lines 24 et seq "The above alkylation process and the process for converting used sulfuric acid catalyst into alkyl sulfates are well known in the prior art. It is also well known to recover alkyl sulfates from an absorption effluent **by extraction into a liquid hydrocarbon.**" Col 1lines 24-28. He further states that in the prior art it has been common practice to recover a mixture of alkyl sulfates such as diisopropyl sulfate and dibutyl sulfate in the extract phase from the extraction step. Col 2 lines 46-50. Accordingly the extraction step comprises a formulation of the mixture of diisopropyl sulfate and dibutyl sulfate in a liquid hydrocarbon. Goldsby differs

from the instant claims because he does not give the concentration of the mixture of the two alkyl sulfates in the liquid hydrocarbon solvent. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to add more or less hydrocarbon to formulate the mixture so that the concentration is within the range claimed since it is a simple task to adjust the concentration of components in a solution and Goldsby clearly teaches the formulation of the mixed dialkyl sulfates in hydrocarbon solvent.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2,3 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret Einsmann whose telephone number is 571-272-1314. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM -4:30 PM M-Th and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1/6/05

Margaret Einsmann
Margaret Einsmann
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751